Soft-/rapidity- anomalous dimensions correspondence

Alexey A. Vladimirov
Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg, D-93040 Regensburg, Germany

We establish a correspondence between ultraviolet singularities of soft factors for multi-particle production and rapidity singularities of soft factors for multi-parton scattering. This correspondence is a consequence of a conformal mapping between scattering geometries. The correspondence is valid to all orders of perturbation theory and in this way provides a proof of rapidity renormalization procedure for multi-parton scattering soft factors (including the transverse momentum dependent (TMD) soft factor as a special case). As a by-product we obtain an exact relation between the rapidity anomalous dimension and the well-known soft anomalous dimension. The three-loop rapidity anomalous dimensions for TMD and a general multi-parton scattering are derived.

arXiv:1610.05791v1 [hep-ph] 18 Oct 2016

Introduction. Factorization theorems are an effective tool for the description of hadron reactions within the perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics (pQCD)[1–5]. Factorization formulas have a common structure which includes a hard part, parton distributions, and soft factor(s). However the operator structure of these ingredients can differ drastically for different processes, that leads to significant fragmentation of theoretical results. In this letter we discuss a correspondence between soft factors (SFs) typical for different kinematics and consequences of this correspondence.

Generally SFs represent the soft part of the between-parton interaction. A typical SF is given by a vacuum matrix element of a configuration of Wilson lines which reflects the classical picture of scattering. Being in many aspects artificial, SFs contain a set of infrared divergences and are defined only within an appropriate regularization. Studying the structure of divergences one gets access to the scaling equations and corresponding anomalous dimensions. In turn it allows one to resum large logarithms of factorization scales and obtain scattering cross-sections in a wide kinematic range.

Considering the processes where several partons participate in *a single* hard interaction one often deals with SFs of the form

$$\mathcal{S}^{\{ab\}}(\{v\}) = \sum_X w_X \Pi_X^{\dagger\{ac\}}(\{v\})\Pi_X^{\{cb\}}(\{v\}), \qquad (1)$$

where X denote the complete set of states, and $\{v\} = v_1, ..., v_N$ are vectors pointing along the momenta of scattering partons. The function Π is given by

$$\Pi_X^{\{ab\}}(\{v\}) = \langle X|T\left[\Phi_{v_1}^{a_1b_1}(0)...\Phi_{v_N}^{a_Nb_N}(0)\right]|0\rangle. \qquad (2)$$

where $\Phi_v(x)$ is a half-infinite Wilson line rooted at x and pointing in the direction v

$$\mathbf{\Phi}_v(x) = P\exp\left(-ig\int_0^\infty d\sigma v^\mu A_\mu^A(v\sigma + x)\mathbf{T}^A\right), \qquad (3)$$

with $\mathbf{T}^A$ being the generator of the gauge group. The pictorial representation of $\mathbf{\Pi}$ is shown in fig.1A. Here and later the bold font denotes the objects with matrix color structure, that in eqns. (1,2) is represented by indices a, b, c. The weight function w_X strongly depends on the type of the factorization theorem and the process under consideration. SFs similar to (1) are very generic and arise in various applications. The most popular examples are: the description of multijet production and event shapes (see e.g. [4–6]), the hard-collinear factorization and Sudakov resummation for several partons (see e.g. [2, 3, 7–9]), and threshold resummation (see e.g.[10–12]). In this letter we discuss only configurations with light-like vectors v ($v_i^2 = 0$) which correspond to scattering of massless or high-energetic partons.

A different configuration appears in the multi-parton scattering [13–16]. In this case partons scatter *pairwise*, and SF reads

$$\Sigma^{\{ac\}}(\{b\}) = \qquad (4)$$
$$\langle 0|T\left[\left(\Phi_{-n}^\dagger\Phi_{-\bar n}\right)^{a_1c_1}(b_1)...\left(\Phi_{-n}^\dagger\Phi_{-\bar n}\right)^{a_Nc_N}(b_N)\right]|0\rangle,$$

where n and $\bar n$ denote a pair of light-like vectors $n^2 = \bar n^2 = 0$ and b are vectors in the transverse plane $(nb_i) = (\bar n b_i) = 0$. The configuration (4) is typical for Drell-Yan-like processes, where all partons belong to initial hadrons. Such processes represent a significant part of the background interactions at high energies. All intervals within the operator (4) are space- or light-like. It allows one to rewrite Σ in the form similar to (1)

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}(\{b\}) = \sum_X w_X \mathbf{\Xi}_{n,X}(\{b\})\mathbf{\Xi}_{\bar n,X}(\{b\}), \qquad (5)$$

where w_X is a unity weight and

$$\Xi_{n,X}^{\{ac\}}(\{b\}) = \langle X|T\left[\Phi_{-n}^{a_1c_1}(b_1)...\Phi_{-n}^{a_Nc_N}(b_N)\right]|0\rangle. \qquad (6)$$

The pictorial representation of $\mathbf{\Xi}$ is shown in fig.1B. SFs $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ are not studied in such details as SFs $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{S}}$, mostly because the subject is relatively new.

The SFs $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ as written in (1) and (4) are color multi-matrices. Generally constituent Wilson lines Φ are of different color representations. Under the gauge rotation the sets of indices $\{a\}$ or $\{b\}$ are transformed by gauge-transformation matrices at the same points [42].



FIG. 1: Geometry of Wilson lines within matrix elements $\Pi^{\{ab\}}$ (A) and $\Xi^{\{ba\}}$ (B). The indices adjusted to the end of Wilson lines are denoted by letters a and b. The conformal transformation (10) maps the infinite sphere S into the transverse plane T, and the origin to the light-like infinity (black point).

Therefore, the singlet elements of SFs are gauge invariant. Naturally, only such combinations contribute into the factorization formulas.

At $N = 2$ SFs $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ are given by the same configuration of Wilson lines. It appears within the transverse momentum dependent (TMD) factorization theorem which describes e.g. unintegrated Drell-Yan process [9, 18]. In our notation this important case reads

$$S(b) = \frac{1}{N_{rep}}\mathrm{Tr}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{S}}(n,\bar{n}) = \frac{1}{N_{rep}}\mathrm{Tr}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(b,0), \qquad (7)$$

where N_{rep} is the dimension of Wilson lines representation. Here for $\mathcal{S}$ we take the weight $w_X = e^{i\hat{P}b}$, and use the Lorentz boost to the frame where $\{v_1, v_2\} = \{n, \bar{n}\}$. TMD SF has been studied in details in various regularizations, see e.g. recent two-loop evaluations [19, 20].

Generally SFs have ultraviolet (UV) and infrared (IR) divergences (in some cases the later are regularized by the weight function w_X). While UV divergences are removed by the renormalization procedure, the IR divergences are inherent part of SFs. For some configurations the IR divergences related to different partons can be separated. In these cases universal process-independent parton substructures can be defined. In particular,the separation of rapidity divergences for the TMD SF [18, 23] results to a well-defined TMD parton distributions [18, 21, 22]. The similar statement for the double-parton scattering ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ at $N = 4$) has been recently observed at two-loop order [16]. In this letter we prove that rapidity divergences can be removed by the renormalization procedure for every $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$. It is equivalent to the statement that rapidity divergences for SFs $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ are factorizable.

Correspondence between Ξ and Π. Individually $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ are not well-defined. First, they are not gauge invariant even if color indices form singlets. Indeed, under the gauge transformation indices $\{b\}$ of $\Pi^{\{ab\}}$ couple to gauge matrices at different points of infinite light-like sphere, and indices $\{a\}$ of $\Xi^{\{ab\}}$ couple to gauge matrices at different points of the transverse plane. Second, $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ have very different set of divergences than SFs. The divergences that characterize interactions between parts of SFs (the rapidity divergences of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{S}}$ and cusp UV divergences of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$) are not presented. Instead the mass-divergences and end-point divergences appear. The end-point divergences are closely related to the gauge properties. In particular they disappear if one chooses the gauge fixing conditions such that fields vanish at the boundary where end-points located. Within the set of such gauges $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ are invariant. For example, $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ is often considered as it stands [2, 3, 7, 8] within covariant gauges (where $A_\mu(x) = 0$ at $x \to \infty$). In this case it is independent on the choice of gauge-fixing parameter. In the following we assume that $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ are considered within appropriate gauge and successful IR regularization, which we call a calculation scheme for brevity.

The matrix elements $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ have substructures that are insensitive to the problems of general ill-definition. These are UV divergences for $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ and rapidity divergences for $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$. The UV divergences of $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ are removed by a renormalization matrix [24, 25]

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}_X^{bare}(\{v\}) = \mathbf{Z}(\{v\})\boldsymbol{\Pi}_X(\{v\}). \qquad (8)$$

The matrix $\mathbf{Z}$ is independent on X and on the calculation scheme. Therefore, the renormalization scale dependence is also calculation scheme independent

$$\mu^2\frac{d}{d\mu^2}\boldsymbol{\Pi}_X(\{v\}) = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_s(\{v\})\boldsymbol{\Pi}_X(\{v\}), \qquad (9)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_s(\{v\})$ is the soft anomalous dimension (sAD). The sAD is an essential part of factorization, and nowadays known up to three-loop order [26].

The matrix element $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{X=0}$ can be transformed to the matrix element $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{X=0}$ by the conformal-stereographic projection [27]

$$\mathcal{C} : \{x^+, x^-, x_T\} \to \Big\{ -\frac{1}{2x^+}, x^- - \frac{x_T^2}{2x^+}, \frac{x_T}{\sqrt{2}x^+}\Big\}, \qquad (10)$$

where we use common notation for the components of a vector $v^+ = (nv)$, $v^- = (\bar{n}v)$ and $(nv_T) = (\bar{n}v_T) = 0$. Applying this transformation to the $\Phi_v^{ab}(0)$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{C}\Phi_v^{ab}(0) \;=\; \Phi_{-n}^{\dagger\, ba}\left(\frac{v_T}{\sqrt{2}v^+}\right). \qquad (11)$$

Therefore, under the transformation $\mathcal{C}$ the matrix element $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ transforms as (see also fig.1)

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{X=0}(\{v\}) \to \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{X=0}(\{b\}). \qquad (12)$$

with $\{b\} = \{v_T/\sqrt{2}v^+\}$. In the following we discuss the consequences of (12) for the structure of divergences.

Changing the geometry of Wilson lines the conformal transformation $\mathcal{C}$ also changes the structure of divergences. In particular the UV divergences of $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ are

mapped into the rapidity divergences of Ξ. Therefore, in a *conformal* field theory the UV finite expression (8) turns into the rapidity-divergence-free expression for Ξ

$$\Xi^{div}_{n,X}(\{b\}) = \mathbf{R}(\{b\})\Xi_{n,X}(\{b\}), \tag{13}$$

where the matrix $\mathbf{R}$ is obtained from the matrix $\mathbf{Z}$ by some transformation of regularizations. The renormalization of rapidity divergences introduces the scale parameter ζ. The dependence on it is given by the rapidity anomalous dimension (rAD)

$$\zeta\frac{d}{d\zeta}\Xi_{n,X}(\{b\}) = 2\mathbf{D}(\{b\})\Xi_{n,X}(\{b\}), \tag{14}$$

where the factor 2 is put to match the definition of TMD rAD. This relation shows that rapidity divergences of Ξ are independent on X (which also follows from the general consideration [28]), and rAD is independent on the calculation scheme (which is known in the TMD case [20, 22, 29]). The renormalization of rapidity divergences in the form (13) was used for the case of TMD SF in many papers (see e.g.[22, 23]). In the following we argue that (13) is also valid for pQCD, where conformal symmetry is violated by quantum corrections.

The matrices $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ are the same matrices, if calculated in some proper regularizations. Therefore, within *conformal* field theory we have the relation

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_s(\{v\}) = 2\mathbf{D}(\{b\}). \tag{15}$$

This relation for TMD kinematics has been recently confirmed for $\mathcal{N}=4$ SYM at three-loop order in [30].

Note, that the transformation (10) is also used to relate the Balitsky-Kovchegov (BK) equation with Banfi-Marchesini-Smye (BMS) equations [31, 32]. In this case the UV singularity is mapped onto collinear one and results into the same non-linear evolution equation.

Relation between rAD and sAD in pQCD. In QCD the conformal invariance and hence the relation (15) are violated by quantum corrections. Nonetheless, the violating terms can be found by studying eqn.(15) at critical coupling where the conformal invariance of QCD is restored [33]. The value of critical coupling a_s^* is defined by the zero of QCD β-function. In the dimension regularization (with $D=4-2\epsilon$) and MS-scheme the β-function is

$$\beta(g) = g(-\epsilon - a_s\beta_0 - a_s^2\beta_1 - ...), \tag{16}$$

where g is QCD coupling constant, $a_s = g^2/(4\pi)^2$ and the coefficients β_n are well-known. The equation $\beta(g^*)=0$ defines the value of $a_s^*(\epsilon)$. Equivalently one can find the number of space-time dimension ϵ^* at which QCD turns to the critical regime, $\epsilon^* = -a_s\beta_0 - a_s^2\beta_1 - ...$.

The essential statement of the approach is that in MS-like schemes UV ADs are *independent* on the choice of ϵ [34, 35]. In other words, sAD has full conformal symmetry and is the same for the physical QCD and the QCD at critical coupling. The rAD does depend on ϵ. At critical coupling the conformal invariance of QCD is restored and the relation (15) holds. Therefore, in QCD we have

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_s(\{v\}) = 2\mathbf{D}(\{b\},\epsilon^*). \tag{17}$$

This relation presents our main result. It connects at all orders of perturbation theory the sAD with the rAD evaluated in the particular (critical) number of dimensions .

Let us test the relation (17) in the simplest case at $N=2$. In this case the matrix structure is reduced to a single entry (7). The sAD has the form [7, 36, 37]

$$\gamma_s(v_1,v_2) = \Gamma_{\rm cusp}(a_s)\ln\left(\frac{v_{12}\mu^2}{\nu^2}\right) - \tilde{\gamma}_s(a_s), \tag{18}$$

where $\Gamma_{\rm cusp}$ is the light-like cusp-anomalous dimension, $v_{ij}=(v_i-v_j)^2$, and ν is some overall IR scale. The coefficients of perturbative expansions $\Gamma_{\rm cusp} = 4C_f a_s + \Gamma_1 a_s^2 + ...$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_s(a_s) = 0\cdot a_s + \tilde{\gamma}_{1s}a_s^2 + ...$ are known up to order a_s^3 [38, 39] (here C_f is the quadratic Casimir eigenvalue for the representation f, dictated by the representation of Wilson lines). At $N=2$ the rAD is reduced to TMD rAD [18–23]

$$\mathrm{tr}\mathbf{D}(b_1,b_2) = N_{rep}\mathcal{D}(L,a_s), \tag{19}$$

where $L=\ln(\mu^2 b_{12}e^{2\gamma_E}/4)$ with $b_{ij}=(b_i-b_j)^2$. The dependence of rAD on the renormalization scale is given by

$$\mu^2\frac{d}{d\mu^2}\mathcal{D}(L,a_s(\mu)) = \frac{\Gamma_{\rm cusp}(a_s)}{2}, \tag{20}$$

which fixes the logarithmic part of $\mathcal{D}$ in terms of $\Gamma_{\rm cusp}$ and β-function (see e.g. collection of formulas in [22]).

Applying the perturbative expansion to eqn.(17) one can obtain higher order terms of $\mathcal{D}$ from the lower order terms and γ_s. To obtain a_s^3-term one needs to consider rAD at a_s^2-order at arbitrary ϵ. It can be found from the calculation made in [19]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(L,a_s,\epsilon) = -2a_sC_f\left(B^\epsilon\Gamma(-\epsilon)+\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) + 2C_fa_s^2\Big\{\\ B^{2\epsilon}\Gamma^2(-\epsilon)\Big[C_A\big(2\psi_{-2\epsilon}-2\psi_{-\epsilon}+\psi_\epsilon+\gamma_E\big)\\ +\frac{1-\epsilon}{(1-2\epsilon)(3-2\epsilon)}\left(\frac{3(4-3\epsilon)}{2\epsilon}C_A - N_f\right)\Big]\\ +B^\epsilon\frac{\Gamma(-\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\beta_0 + \frac{\beta_0}{2\epsilon^2} - \frac{\Gamma_1}{2\epsilon}\Big\} + \mathcal{O}(a_s^3),\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where $B=e^L$, N_f is number of fermions. Under the conformal transformation (10) the variable v_{ij} turns to b_{ij} with unknown prefactor, which cannot be fixed due to light-like origin of vectors v. This prefactor can be absorbed to the variable ν, which we find by matching the leading order expressions $\nu = 2e^{-\gamma_E}$. Considering the perturbative expansion at critical ϵ^* we obtain

$$\Gamma_{\rm cusp}(a_s)L - \tilde{\gamma}_s(a_s) = 2\mathcal{D}(L,a_s) + 2\delta\mathcal{D}(L,a_s), \tag{22}$$

where

$$\delta\mathcal{D}(L,a_s) = -a_s^2 C_f\beta_0(L^2+\zeta_2) + a_s^3 C_f\Big[-\frac{2\beta_0^2}{3}L^3 - \left(\frac{\beta_0\Gamma_1}{2}+\beta_1\right)L^2 + \beta_0(\tilde\gamma_{1s}-2\beta_0\zeta_2)L -\beta_0\Gamma_1\frac{\zeta_2}{4} - \zeta_2\beta_1 + \frac{2\beta_0^2}{3}\left(\zeta_3-\frac{82}{9}\right) +26\beta_0 C_A\left(\zeta_4-\frac{8}{27}\right)\Big] + \mathcal{O}(a_s^4). \quad (23)$$

Comparing the perturbative orders of eqn.(22) we express TMD rAD in terms of sAD (or vise-versa) up to order a_s^3. The finite part of $\mathcal{D}$ is

$$\mathcal{D}(0,a_s) = a_s^2\left(C_f\beta_0\zeta_2 - \frac{\tilde\gamma_{1s}}{2}\right) - a_s^3\left(\frac{\tilde\gamma_{2s}}{2}+X\right)+\mathcal{O}(a_s^4), \quad (24)$$

where X is given by the last two lines of (23). This expression coincides with the result of direct calculation [30]. The logarithmic part of $\mathcal{D}$ is dictated by eqn.(20) and exactly reproduced in (22). This example gives a non-trivial confirmation of correspondence presented in this letter.

Using (17) we can also derive the rAD for a general multi-parton scattering configuration at a_s^3-order. Its color structure has the form

$$\mathbf{D}(\{b\}) = \sum_{1\leqslant i<j}^{N} \mathbf{T}_i^A\mathbf{T}_j^A\mathcal{D}(L_{ij},a_s) \quad (25)$$
$$+f^{AB\alpha}f^{\alpha CD}\Big[\sum_{i,j,k,l}\mathbf{T}_i^A\mathbf{T}_j^B\mathbf{T}_k^C\mathbf{T}_l^D\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(b_i,b_j,b_k,b_l) + \sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant j<k\\ i\neq j,k}}^{N}\{\mathbf{T}_i^A,\mathbf{T}_i^D\}\mathbf{T}_j^B\mathbf{T}_k^C\tilde{C}(b_i,b_j,b_k)\Big] + ...$$

where indices i,j,k,l enumerate Wilson lines in Ξ, the summation indices in the second line are all different, f^{ABC} is the gauge-group structure constant and dots denote the color structures that appear at higher perturbative orders. The functions $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\tilde{C}$ are of order a_s^3. We have obtained this expression by resolving the color algebra of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ in terms of the generating function for web-diagrams [40, 41]. Note the absence of color structures like $f^{ABC}\mathbf{T}_i^A\mathbf{T}_j^B\mathbf{T}_k^C$ or $f^{AB\alpha}f^{\alpha CD}\{\mathbf{T}_i^A\mathbf{T}_i^D\}\mathbf{T}_j^B\mathbf{T}_k^C$, which in principal could appear at this order. In the limit $N=2$ all the color structures except the leading one are zero, therefore, the first line represents TMD rAD (in sAD terminology it is called a dipole contribution). Eqn.(25) agrees with the two-loop calculation of $\mathbf{D}$ [16].

The non-dipole contribution to sAD evaluated at a_s^3-order in [26] has the same color structure as found by us for rAD (25), which grants an additional check for relation (17). Due to the fact that functions $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\tilde{C}$ are of a_s^3 order, they are not affected by conformal-symmetry violating corrections at this order. Therefore, comparing with [26] we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(b_i,b_j,b_k,b_l) = \mathcal{F}(\rho_{ikjl},\rho_{iljk}) + \mathcal{O}(a_s^4), \quad (26)$$
$$\tilde{C}(b_i,b_j,b_k) = -\zeta_2\zeta_3 - \zeta_5/2 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^4), \quad (27)$$

where $\rho_{ijkl} = b_{ij}b_{kl}/b_{ik}b_{jl}$ is the conformal ratio. The explicit form of function $\mathcal{F}$ can be found in [26].

Conclusion. We have shown that UV divergence of the "multi-cusp" configuration of light-like Wilson lines is related by the conformal transformation to the rapidity divergence of set of parallel light-like half-infinite Wilson lines. This correspondence is exact in any conformal field theory and violated by β-function corrections in QCD. The main consequence of the correspondence is that rapidity divergences can be removed from a (matrix) SF (4) by a singular (matrix) factor, analogous to UV renormalization factor. This statement holds at arbitrary perturbative order in conformal field theory *and QCD* (at least in MS-like schemes), because the β-function corrections modify only numerical values of factors but not the color or divergence structure. Therefore, we have proven the renormalization of rapidity divergences for configurations of Wilson lines of type (4). The proof of rapidity renormalization procedure supplements many factorization theorems, and allows rigorous definition of corresponding parton distribution, such as TMD parton distribution and double-parton distributions. In the particular case of TMD kinematics the rapidity renormalization is known and has been discussed in many papers, e.g. [18–23]. For the case of double-parton scattering it has been demonstrated at two-loop order in [16].

The equivalence of rapidity and UV renormalization factors leads to the equality of rapidity and soft ADs in a conformal field theory, which was also observed in direct calculations [30]. In QCD the terms violating this equality can be found by considering QCD at the critical coupling. We have derived the violating terms for TMD kinematics up to a_s^3 order, and confirmed the result for recent three-loop evaluation of rAD made in [30]. Also we have obtained the general matrix-valued rAD for a multi-parton scattering at order a_s^3. Its color structure repeats those of sAD, what we have checked explicitly within the generating function approach [40, 41]. The leading color-quadrapole contribution is obtained from the corresponding terms of sAD [26]. The obtained expressions up to order a_s^2 coincide with results of calculation [16], while a_s^3 order is a new result.

The presented study makes a bridge between seemingly very different kinematic regimes, namely the multi-particle production and the multi-parton scattering. The exact relation between sAD and rAD is an immediate result, and probably much more would come with a deeper study.

The author is grateful to V.Braun, A.Manashov and I.Scimemi for multiple discussions, and also to D.Neill for

the introduction into BK-to-BMS relation which initiated this research.

[1] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper and G. F. Sterman, Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys. **5** (1989) 1 doi:10.1142/9789814503266_0001 [hep-ph/0409313].

[2] I. Feige and M. D. Schwartz, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) no.10, 105020 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.105020 [arXiv:1403.6472 [hep-ph]].

[3] H. Contopanagos, E. Laenen and G. F. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B **484** (1997) 303 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(96)00567-6 [hep-ph/9604313].

[4] S. D. Ellis, A. Hornig, C. Lee, C. K. Vermilion and J. R. Walsh, Phys. Lett. B **689** (2010) 82 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.04.019 [arXiv:0912.0262 [hep-ph]].

[5] C. W. Bauer, A. Hornig and F. J. Tackmann, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 114013 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.114013 [arXiv:0808.2191 [hep-ph]].

[6] S. D. Ellis, C. K. Vermilion, J. R. Walsh, A. Hornig and C. Lee, JHEP **1011** (2010) 101 doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2010)101 [arXiv:1001.0014 [hep-ph]].

[7] N. Kidonakis, G. Oderda and G. F. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B **531** (1998) 365 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00441-6 [hep-ph/9803241].

[8] R. Bonciani, S. Catani, M. L. Mangano and P. Nason, Phys. Lett. B **575** (2003) 268 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2003.09.068 [hep-ph/0307035].

[9] C. W. Bauer, D. Pirjol and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 054022 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.054022 [hep-ph/0109045].

[10] N. Kidonakis, G. Oderda and G. F. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B **525** (1998) 299 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00243-0 [hep-ph/9801268].

[11] E. Laenen, G. Oderda and G. F. Sterman, Phys. Lett. B **438** (1998) 173 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00960-5 [hep-ph/9806467].

[12] T. Becher, M. Neubert and G. Xu, JHEP **0807** (2008) 030 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/07/030 [arXiv:0710.0680 [hep-ph]].

[13] M. Diehl, D. Ostermeier and A. Schafer, JHEP **1203** (2012) 089 doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2012)089 [arXiv:1111.0910 [hep-ph]].

[14] A. V. Manohar and W. J. Waalewijn, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012) 114009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.114009 [arXiv:1202.3794 [hep-ph]].

[15] M. Diehl, J. R. Gaunt, D. Ostermeier, P. Plossl and A. Schafer, JHEP **1601** (2016) 076 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2016)076 [arXiv:1510.08696 [hep-ph]].

[16] A. Vladimirov, arXiv:1608.04920 [hep-ph].

[17] M. Garcia-Echevarria, A. Idilbi and I. Scimemi, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 011502 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.011502 [arXiv:1104.0686 [hep-ph]].

[18] J. Collins, (Cambridge monographs on particle physics, nuclear physics and cosmology. 32)

[19] M. G. Echevarria, I. Scimemi and A. Vladimirov, Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.5, 054004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.054004 [arXiv:1511.05590 [hep-ph]].

[20] T. Lübbert, J. Oredsson and M. Stahlhofen, JHEP **1603** (2016) 168 doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2016)168 [arXiv:1602.01829 [hep-ph]].

[21] M. G. Echevarra, A. Idilbi and I. Scimemi, Phys. Lett. B **726** (2013) 795 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.09.003 [arXiv:1211.1947 [hep-ph]].

[22] M. G. Echevarria, I. Scimemi and A. Vladimirov, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2016)004 arXiv:1604.07869 [hep-ph].

[23] J. Y. Chiu, A. Jain, D. Neill and I. Z. Rothstein, JHEP **1205** (2012) 084 doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2012)084 [arXiv:1202.0814 [hep-ph]].

[24] R. A. Brandt, F. Neri and M. a. Sato, Phys. Rev. D **24** (1981) 879. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.24.879

[25] V. S. Dotsenko and S. N. Vergeles, Nucl. Phys. B **169** (1980) 527. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(80)90103-0

[26] O. Almelid, C. Duhr and E. Gardi, arXiv:1507.00047 [hep-ph].

[27] L. Cornalba, arXiv:0710.5480 [hep-th].

[28] O. Erdogan and G. Sterman, Phys. Rev. D **91** (2015) no.6, 065033 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.065033 [arXiv:1411.4588 [hep-ph]].

[29] J. C. Collins and T. C. Rogers, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) no.3, 034018 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.034018 [arXiv:1210.2100 [hep-ph]].

[30] Y. Li and H. X. Zhu, [arXiv:1604.01404 [hep-ph]].

[31] Y. Hatta, JHEP **0811** (2008) 057 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/11/057 [arXiv:0810.0889 [hep-ph]].

[32] E. Avsar, Y. Hatta and T. Matsuo, JHEP **0906** (2009) 011 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/06/011 [arXiv:0903.4285 [hep-ph]].

[33] T. Banks and A. Zaks, Nucl. Phys. B **196** (1982) 189. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(82)90035-9

[34] V. M. Braun and A. N. Manashov, Eur. Phys. J. C **73** (2013) 2544 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2544-1 [arXiv:1306.5644 [hep-th]].

[35] V. M. Braun, A. N. Manashov, S. Moch and M. Strohmaier, JHEP **1603** (2016) 142 doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2016)142 [arXiv:1601.05937 [hep-ph]].

[36] S. M. Aybat, L. J. Dixon and G. F. Sterman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97** (2006) 072001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.072001 [hep-ph/0606254].

[37] E. Gardi and L. Magnea, JHEP **0903** (2009) 079 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/03/079 [arXiv:0901.1091 [hep-ph]].

[38] S. Moch, J. A. M. Vermaseren and A. Vogt, Nucl. Phys. B **688** (2004) 101 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2004.03.030 [hep-ph/0403192].

[39] S. Moch, J. A. M. Vermaseren and A. Vogt, Phys. Lett. B **625** (2005) 245 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2005.08.067 [hep-ph/0508055].

[40] A. A. Vladimirov, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) no.6, 066007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.066007 [arXiv:1406.6253 [hep-th]].

[41] A. A. Vladimirov, JHEP **1506** (2015) 120 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2015)120 [arXiv:1501.03316 [hep-th]].

[42] Additional transverse Wilson links can be added to definition of (6) to enforce the gauge invariance [17]. It is not necessary if fields vanish at light-like infinities, e.g. in covariant gauges.